



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,224	08/27/2003	Masaki Sano	03151	4309

23338 7590 12/04/2006

DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD
1727 KING STREET
SUITE 105
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MONDT, JOHANNES P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,224

Applicant(s)

SANO, MASAKI

Examiner

Johannes P. Mondt

Art Unit

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,7,8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,7,8 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Declaration filed on 9/20/06 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Nitta et al reference.

In particular, inventor declares: "I have completed the invention" (prior to the filing of the Nitta reference (i.e., prior to April 8, 2002). See page 1 of said Declaration.

According to MPEP. 37 C.F.R. 1.131(b):

"However, the showing of facts shall be such, in character and weight, as to establish reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference, or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to said date to a subsequent reduction to practice or to the filing of the application. Original exhibits of drawings or records, or photocopies thereof, must accompany and form part of the affidavit or declaration or their absence must be satisfactorily explained.

[24 FR 10332, Dec. 22, 1959; 34 FR 18857, Nov. 26, 1969; para. (a), 48 FR 2713, Jan. 20, 1983, effective Feb. 27, 1983; para. (a), 50 FR 9381, Mar. 7, 1985, effective May 8, 1985; 50 FR 11366, Mar. 21, 1985; 53 FR 23733, June 23, 1988, effective Sept. 12, 1988; para. (a)(1) revised and para. (a)(2) added, 60 FR 21043, May 1, 1995, effective May 31, 1995; para. (a) revised, 61 FR 42790, Aug. 19, 1996, effective Sept. 23, 1996; heading and para. (a) revised, 65 FR 54604, Sept. 8, 2000, effective Sept. 8, 2000; para. (a) revised, 65 FR 57024, Sept. 20, 2000, effective Nov. 29, 2000; para. (a)(1) revised, 69 FR 49959, Aug. 12, 2004, effective Sept. 13, 2004; para. (b) revised, 69 FR 56481, Sept. 21, 2004, effective Oct. 21, 2004]".

In the underlying case, Applicant, in support of his Declaration, has not provided evidence for reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference, because

the Specification submitted as evidence in support of said Declaration fails to teach the following limitations:

(a) With regard to the independent claim 7:

(1) "a transparent resin sealing the LED". Specifically, no sealing characteristic or property of the resin with regard to the LED is taught. The verb "mold" is different in meaning from "seal", the former meaning "to give shape", the latter meaning to provide a closure that "must be broken to be opened" (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, tenth Edition, 1998).

(2) "an exposed peripheral portion of the transparent sealing resin including a permeated dye": the closest passage in the Specification submitted as exhibit is the first paragraph of page 2; however, only the various LEDs are immersed in a dye liquid, not necessarily the epoxy resin.

In conclusion, no reduction to practice is in evidence from said Specification as submitted with said Declaration.

Furthermore, the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Nitta et al reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

Art Unit: 3663

Insufficient conception shows in the quantitatively fixed nature of the x and y coordinates of the white LED and the equally fixed immersion, in concentration, duration, and recommendation for stirring, quite independently of said x and y coordinates, with chromaticity correction merely being suggested through footnote only (page 2), not disclosed in a detailed description of the invention, this while chromaticity allegedly is changed based on a chromaticity of the light emitted from the LED (see claim 7).

Even arguendo, any conception if shown should have been combined with evidence of due diligence to subsequent reduction to practice, - which as we have seen is not in evidence, or filing of the application, i.e., due diligence must be evident from July 8, 2002, to August 27, 2003. Applicant has not provided any evidence in support of a showing of due diligence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. ***Claim 3, 7, 8 and 10*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nitta et al (US 2002/0190262 A1).

On claim 7: Nitta et al teach an LED device (Figures 25 and 29 (N.B.: see also Figures 2 and 4 for description of the properties of the first embodiment over which Figures 25 and 29 distinguish through the addition of phosphor particles 110; see below); title, abstract, [0040]-[0154], and [0332]-[0340]) comprising: an LED mounted on a substrate (any of resin stem 100 (see [0083]-[0087], lead 101 ([0086]), adhesive 107 ([0123]) or the horizontal portion of resin 103 underneath 101; see Figure 1B for numeral 103 to the substrate and see [0090]); a transparent resin 111 ([0085] and [0092]-[0105]) sealing the LED (inherently, silicone resin is transparent and it also must be for the LED to be operative, because 111 embeds the LED; see Figures 25 and 29), the transparent resin including phosphor particles 110 ([0039], [0067], [0069], [0073]) distributed therein inherently capable of changing a chromaticity of light emitted from the LED to another chromaticity, based on the chromaticity of the light emitted from the LED; and

an exposed (see illustration of the first embodiment and of Figures 25 and 29) peripheral portion 213 (see [0136]-[0139] and [0332]-[0333]), of the transparent sealing resin including a permeated dye ([0139] and [0332]-[0333]); said dye is permeated because said dye is colored and for coloring it is necessary that the coloring agent permeates the substance that is colored). Said exposed peripheral portion seals the LED (see Figures 25 and 29).

The further limitation "for correcting the color of the light transmitted through the transparent resin...." indicates intention of use, and as such constitutes functional language, while "and sealing the LED" constitutes a product-by-process limitation.

Art Unit: 3663

With regard to functional language, In reference to the claim language referring to the above limitation “for correcting....”, intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

The limitation “and sealing the LED” is a method step, and is only of patentable weight in as much as the method steps distinguish the final structure, and to the extent not impacting final structure are taken to be product-by-process limitations and non-limiting. A product by process claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how they are actually made. See In re Fessman, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974); In re Marosi et al, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983), and In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985), all of which make clear that it is the patentability of the final structure of the product “gleaned” from the process steps that must be determined in a “product-by-process” claim, and not the patentability of the process. See also MPEP 2113. Moreover, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not a patentable product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not.

Finally, with regard to the claim language “for changing” (lines 4-5) and “based upon” (line 6), intended use and other types of functional language must result in a

structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

On claims 3 and 10: Because said dye absorbs light transmitted through the transparent resin and the color inherently represents the light NOT absorbed said dye has a complementary color to the color of the light transmitted through the transparent resin, and hence the further limitation defined by claim 3 is met.

In reference to the claim language referring to "for a desired color of light", intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

On claim 8: the LED device is capable for producing white light (see [0230]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/20/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please be referred to "Response to Amendment" overleaf in Response to the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131. Furthermore, the amendment to claim 7 merely replaces one specification of intended use for another. The claims thus stand rejected over the prior art of record. Applicant states to have carefully considered the office action of April 7, 2006. However, half of one page was devoted to the proper

rejection of all dependent claims 3, 8 and 10, which appears to have been missed by applicant, probably because of the typographic omission of dependent claims by error in the heading. For this reason the present office action, correcting said typographic error, is herewith made non-final.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johannes P. Mondt whose telephone number is 571-272-1919. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 18:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack W. Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JPM

Application/Control Number: 10/648,224

Page 9

Art Unit: 3663

November 25, 2006

Patent Examiner:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Mondt', is written over the printed name.

Johannes Mondt (Art Unit: 3663)